

other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

#### REVISIONS TO ALLOCATION FOR HOUSE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with sections 213 and 221 of H. Con. Res. 83, I hereby submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD adjustments to the section 302(a) allocation to the House Committee on Agriculture, set forth in H. Rept. 107-60, to reflect \$0 billion in additional new budget authority and outlays for fiscal year 2002 and \$28.492 billion in additional budget authority and \$25.860 billion in additional outlays for the period of fiscal years 2002 through 2006.

Section 213 of H. Con. Res. 83 authorizes the Chairman of the House Budget Committee to increase the 302(a) allocation of the Committee on Agriculture for legislation that reauthorizes the Federal Agriculture Improvement Act of 1996, title I of that Act, or other appropriate agricultural production legislation.

Section 221 provides that for the purpose of enforcing H. Con. Res. 83, the applicable allocations are those set forth for fiscal year 2002 and for the total for the period of Fiscal Years 2002 through 2006. This section further provides that the Chairman is authorized to make the necessary adjustments in the allocations and aggregates to carry out the purposes of the budget resolution.

Both as reported by the Committee on Agriculture and as modified by the rule, the bill is within the levels assumed for this bill in the two periods applicable to the House; Fiscal Year 2002 and for the total of Fiscal Years 2002 through 2006 as required under section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

If you have any questions, please contact Jim Bates of my staff at 6-7270.

#### TERRORISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I want to visit about a couple of areas in regards to terrorism. Obviously, the issues that are on this floor, the issues that have overwhelmed the United States since the ugly events of September 11 have centered on terrorism and centered on de-

fense and the home security of this Nation.

This afternoon I want to spend a few minutes of my Special Order talking about two different types of terrorism and what we can do about it, and also incorporate in some of the defense mechanisms for some of the homeland security that I think we need to have.

Mr. Speaker, let me begin by talking about a level of terrorism that has been lost in the battle, and that is the concept called ecoterrorism that is occurring within the borders of the United States.

What does ecoterrorism roughly describe? What has happened is there are some activists out there, citizens of this country or people acting within the borders of this country in regards to environmental issues that feel that they can only get attention if they do some type of destruction to some symbol, whether it is putting steel rods into a tree that they are afraid is going to be cut for timber so that the logger who comes up and uses a chain saw risks hitting that steel nail with his chain saw, and could physically harm him; and thus, the loggers, knowing that these trees may have these steel spikes inserted randomly into trees, they are afraid to log them; to the situation we had in Vail, Colorado, where they burned down a \$13 million lodge all using the front of environmentalism.

Mr. Speaker, many of us on this floor feel very strong about the environment of this country; but none of us on this floor should tolerate for one moment ecoterrorism, the kind of things that occurred in Vail, Colorado, the kind of things that occurred in the district of the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), the kinds of things where people intentionally spike these trees so that somebody that goes in to log any of these trees stands the risk of losing their life if they put a chain saw to that tree. That type of behavior is unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, I am chairman of the Subcommittee on Forest and Forest Health of the Committee on Resources, and we will be focusing in the several months ahead on ecoterrorism and what we can do to encourage people in this country to work within the framework of our law if they have disagreement on environmental policies.

Unfortunately, what has happen is some people are looking for a cause. Deep down they do not care about the environment. They care about destruction, and they want to hook onto any kind of cause they can hook onto. We have seen this in many of the protests. Many of the people, outside of the professionals who have been hired to run the protests, many people do not have a deep-down belief in the cause that they are protesting or the cause for which they are assisting ecoterrorism within the boundaries of the country.

It is just a cause. It is something for them to do.

□ 1800

Unfortunately what has happened is some people have turned a blind eye, because this destruction, this terrorism, is being activated under the so-called cloak of protecting the environment.

As I said earlier, all of my colleagues here feel strongly about the protection of our environment. Sure we have different debates on how we interpret that issue. But nobody on this floor, I would hope, would condone ecoterrorism in this country. And in the not too distant future, we ought to have people like the National Sierra Club, like Earth First, like the Conservation League, without prompting from the United States Congress, these organizations ought to step forward and actively condemn acts of ecoterrorism to try and forward some type of environmental agenda.

It is a problem in this country and it is a problem that has begun to escalate. It is getting bigger and bigger. They went from putting spikes in a tree to damaging equipment that was sitting on a site. Pretty soon they moved up to burning \$13 million buildings in Vail, Colorado, which is within my district. These types of acts to me are dangerous acts. Obviously they do not rise to the level of the horrible terrorism that we saw on September 11, and I intend to spend a good part of my time this evening, or this afternoon, addressing those particular issues.

But it, nonetheless, is a small cancer of its own. It is a cancer that we have to get ahead of. And it is something that we have to have a zero tolerance for in our society.

I urge my colleagues, if you have any constituents out there that share with you any type of support that they are giving to ecoterrorist type of activity, that you actively discourage them, and if any kind of information is shared with you that these individuals are breaking the law, I think you have an obligation to go to the authorities and report your conversation with these ecoterrorists. We have to adopt and every respectable environmental organization in this country ought to adopt a zero tolerance of ecoterrorism. We have seen what happens when so-called terrorism gets taken out of context, when so-called terrorism goes to the extent that it has gone on September 11.

So we need to get on top of this ecoterrorism that we now are seeing within our own borders, our own citizens who have chosen not to work within the framework of the law but to break the law and to flagrantly break the law in such a way as to cause ecoterrorism.

We had a hearing today. We have issued a subpoena. There is an organization out there called ELF, E-L-F.

This organization has a spokesman. This spokesman, I think, is probably one of the most radical American citizens in regards to ecoterrorism. I have asked that that individual be subpoenaed.

Today, the full Committee on Resources, not the subcommittee, but the full Committee on Resources issued a subpoena. We fully intend to serve that subpoena and have that individual appear in front of my subcommittee, and hopefully later on in front of the full committee, to explain on what basis that an individual or a group of individuals or an organization or an association should be allowed to step out and create this type of terrorist act under the guise of protection of the environment.

I am going to go on. I want to proceed from ecoterrorism and make the transition here to the terrorist acts of September 11.

Before I do that, Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to yield to my colleague the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

RURAL DEVELOPMENT AMENDMENT TO FARM  
SECURITY ACT OF 2001

Mrs. CLAYTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I appreciate it very much. I do understand the importance of the subject and appreciate him allowing me to proceed.

Mr. Speaker, I stand before this body once again to focus attention on the matter of our struggling rural communities and on the need to increase our investment in rural development.

Today, we heard on this floor time after time from Member after Member about the struggles of rural America. We have heard in great detail about the difficulties that our rural communities face and have been called upon to respond accordingly. Many have testified to the fact that when the farm economy of rural America suffers, so too does the rest of America, and that is indeed true. Clearly, agriculture has long played and will continue to play an important role in the well-being of rural America. That is why I support the Farm Security Act of 2001 and also urge my colleagues to pass it. It provides a strong safety net for American agricultural producers and rural America in trying times for the farm economy.

While I do not think that anybody in this body among my colleagues doubts the critical role that agriculture plays in the rural economy, I believe that we must ask ourselves whether agriculture alone can redeem rural America. The statistics that the census has recently provided us indicate that we are losing many of our most productive young people because rural America has very little to offer them. A farm safety net will provide a refuge for our farmers during times of economic hardship and we should do this. This is as it should be. We should do that. But we

must ask ourselves, will the farm safety net create nonfarm jobs or a safety net for persons who are not in agriculture? Will the safety net help our rural communities deal with the multi-billion-dollar backlog of unfunded infrastructure projects, whether it is water or sewage or roads or telecommunication?

Will this safety net increase the economic livelihood of the workers who have to drive 60 miles round trip to work at a Wal-Mart where they get \$6.25 an hour or to the textile person who drives a similar amount and maybe only gets \$8, or to a poultry factory? Will it provide running water to the 1 million rural Americans who still, after the remarkable economic boom of the 1990s, do not have running water in their home? We do not now, not in every home. In fact, in rural America we still have a large proportion of Americans without running water. Will it prevent the great hollowing out of rural America that I referred to earlier that is currently taking place once again? And will rural America be a good place for young people to stay and raise their family and have an expectation that they will have a quality of life?

I say with deep, deep regret, and disappointment, but the answer to these questions is no. This Congress must begin thinking of rural America, not just as farmers, we must include our farmers obviously, and they are struggling, who struggle with low commodity prices. We must have them involved. They are central to anything we do. But we must also start thinking about their families, their neighbors, their communities. We must think about rural America as that woman I spoke of, the person who works for the poultry factory or works for the textile factory, if the factory is still there, by the way, and cannot sustain their families. That is a part of the fabric of rural America.

We must do more for rural America. I believe we can start with this farm bill. That is why I am offering an amendment to increase rural development funding in this farm bill by \$1 billion over the next 10 years. Will this amendment solve the problems that I have been discussing earlier? Of course, it will not. The answer is no. No one is suggesting that any one bill or any one thing will be the magic bullet that saves rural America. But what I am suggesting is that we need to broaden both our view and our investment in rural America. My amendment is just the first step in doing this.

The boom time of the 1990s that benefited so much of America never touched many rural areas. When I talk with people back in my district, which is an overwhelmingly rural district, they do not need to be warned about the fact that we may have an economy that may be slipping into recession.

You see, they already know that they are in one, because their farmers have low prices, they have seen their textile industry close, they have seen factories indeed promised to come, making decisions not to relocate.

Joining me in offering this amendment are my colleagues, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON), the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) and the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS). The amendment provides \$450 million for rural drinking water infrastructure grants and \$450 million for community strategic planning assistance and investment, and \$100 million for value-added agricultural market development grants over the next 10 years.

I would like to reiterate once again, this farm bill must serve American farmers. And it does. It does very generously. But it must also serve their families, their neighbors, their communities. It must serve the 90 percent of rural Americans who are not employed in the agricultural economy. The Committee on Agriculture can take a leadership role on this and I beg them to do that. I also beg my colleagues to support my amendment tomorrow.

The term "balance" has come up many times in this debate on the floor about the Committee on Agriculture. I would like to associate myself with the call of my colleagues for a balanced farm bill. The committee bill that we are considering today is a good start. I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their efforts. But I would like to suggest that indeed they can do more, and the Clayton-Peterson-Blumenauer-Gibbons amendment does not imbalance the bill. In fact, it adds more balance. It accepts the principle we set in the committee. We are actually providing a substantial investment. In the end, it simply doubles the amount that we are giving to 90 percent of the people who are in rural America. It provides for producers, but it provides for many other people who are living in rural America across the country whose problems do not stop or end at the field's edge.

I urge my colleagues to reject the notion that a vote for the Clayton-Peterson-Blumenauer-Gibbons amendment is a vote against farmers. I reject the notion that farmers are selfish. I know farmers who care about clean drinking water, farmers who care about infrastructure because they know if their communities in which they are living do not have these grants, their tax base goes up. They also want a viable community that is around them because they want their children and their neighbors to have an opportunity, and they also know so very well what it means to have value-added, to add long-term productivity to their raw commodity.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill and support rural



America. I, again, thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of my comments, I talked about ecoterrorism in the United States. I want my colleagues to understand that it is the goal of my committee that I chair, the Subcommittee on Forests and Forest Health, which has jurisdiction over some of the properties upon which the crime of ecoterrorism has occurred, that our committee is considering this a priority, and in light of the horrible terrorist act that occurred on September 11, once we restabilize from that situation, our subcommittee intends to aggressively pursue those people who condone or somehow participate in ecoterrorism within the boundaries of our country.

Terrorist acts of any kind, to forward or push forward the agenda of any cause, is improper when utilized in that type of form.

We have wonderful laws in this country, and there are lots of laws, and our Constitution itself provides for things like the freedom of speech. You can walk down and protest, the freedom of protest. There are lots of tools available to those who object to current laws or to those who object to the direction this country is going without you having to resort to breaking a law. That is the key issue here. Whether it is terrorism performed by another country, which we unfortunately saw on September 11, or whether it is ecoterrorism that is performed within our own boundaries.

I just want to remind my colleagues, this is exactly what took place in my district. My district is the Third Congressional District of the State of Colorado. It is the mountains of Colorado. We have up there Vail, Colorado, and in Vail, Colorado, just 3 years ago, we had some terrorists, U.S. citizens, we suspect, and we suspect from an organization called the ELF organization that went up, and this structure is a \$13 million structure and it was completely inflamed. They burned that structure. That structure was not built illegally. That structure was not in violation of any local zoning code. It was just in violation of the mindset of a few radical, criminal elements within the boundaries of our country who decided that the only way to address this issue was not to approach the local zoning board, not to approach any elected officials, not to go out and have an open protest at the city center.

□ 1815

Instead, the way to do it is very slyly at night sneak in and put all kinds of fuel in this lodge and burn it to the ground. I wish those people knew how many trees were cut to replace the trees that were burned in this lodge. I wish those people that committed that act of eco-terrorism understood how

many jobs were lost. Not jobs of multimillionaires or jobs of executives; these are jobs of people that ran concessionaire shops, or jobs of people, even the maintenance people, that worked in these facilities. They lost their jobs. I hope those eco-terrorists feel real proud of themselves.

But I want people to know, and I want my colleagues to understand, that I intend to continue to pressure our law enforcement agencies to pursue eco-terrorism as actively as they are pursuing other criminal acts against our society. I appreciate the committee's support today. We had only one "no" vote in the committee, in the whole committee, which objected to the issuance of a subpoena to this spokesman for the organization called ELF, which is probably the most radical eco-terrorist organization in the United States.

Now let me transition, because I want to talk for the rest of my time about the horrible cancer that we have discovered and we have suffered since September 11. We actually know that the cancer existed beforehand, but September 11 is obviously where it was made evident.

All of us understand exactly what I am talking about. My comparison to terrorism and cancer, I think, is an analogy which fits perfectly. I know of no cancer, I know of no cancer, ever discovered in the history of mankind that is friendly to the human body. I know of no cancer that has ever been discovered or researched by the medical experts in our country that is recommended for the human body. Cancer is cancer, and it is deadly in many cases.

We know that we have to take an aggressive fight against cancer. You cannot love cancer away. Do not misunderstand me. Love is an important element. It helps build up the psychological strength that you need to fight cancer. You cannot pray cancer away.

Many people, many of your constituents may disagree with me and believe that prayer alone will get rid of that cancer. In my opinion, and I am a strong Christian, in my opinion the Supreme Being that I believe in thinks that a person has to deploy a little self-help; that, sure, prayer is a necessary part of the fight against cancer, but you cannot do it on prayer alone. You have got to go in and aggressively cut that cancer out of there.

That is exactly what we need to do with terrorism. That act of terrorism, no matter what they say, no matter if they try and justify it, justify the terrorist act of September 11, do not buy it for one moment. It is a vicious cancer, and no cancer is good for the human body. And no act of terrorism is good, for not only our society, it is not good for the society of the entire world, regardless of which country you come from.

We need to battle this, and we need to battle it as aggressively as any one of my colleagues would battle cancer within your own body. Not for one moment, if you had cancer, and some of my colleagues have experienced it, not for one moment have you ever found anybody that says, well, the cancer in your body is justified. You had it coming. You deserved that cancer because of an action you took. Even for those people who smoke, we do not say to them, well, you deserve the cancer. We may say, look, you may have contributed to this, but it does not justice the cancer. It is the same thing with this terrorism.

I would ask people as you begin, and I am beginning to see this in newspaper articles, or I am beginning to see it in the commentary and editorial papers, well, the United States, you know, when we sit back and take a look at it, maybe the United States was too aggressive on its foreign policy, or maybe the United States kind of deserved it because they were bullies.

What a bunch of crap; unacceptable crap, in my opinion. Unacceptable. There is no justification, there is no excuse, none, zero, that you can put forward for the kind of atrocities that were performed against this country, that were activated against the people of the world.

Remember, remember, 80 separate countries lost citizens in these terrorist attacks of September 11. Every ethnic race that I know of, every ethnic background that I know of suffered losses as a result of this terrorist act. The Muslim people, people of Islam, the religion of Islam and the Muslim population suffered some horrible losses in this act of terrorism.

This act of terrorism did not discriminate between women and children and mothers and fathers and military officials and policemen and firemen. It did not do any discrimination. It went out and destroyed every human part that it could get its hands on, just as cancer does.

Cancer shows no discrimination. Cancer comes after you, and that is exactly what these terrorists have done. We need to go after this aggressively as our society feels about cancer. And cancer, as we know, to take it on, is a long-term battle, and it requires lots of resources to be able to conquer it.

It is the same thing here. Do not let anybody try and justify or say that the United States somehow deserved or somehow walked into this act of terrorism, this act of barbarism.

Thank goodness we have the leadership team that we have in place today, because, you see, again another analogy to cancer. It is like cancer on the brain. Our President and his team, whether it is Condoleezza Rice, whether it is Colin Powell, whether it is Donald Rumsfeld, his defense team, his team he has at the White House, realizes that when you have got cancer on

the brain, you cannot blow the brain out of the body, out of the skull. You have to do very medical, very careful, very focused surgery so as to be able to go into the brain, take the cancer out of the brain, and leave the brain, as much of it intact as is possible.

The White House and our government, and I am very proud of the response that our government so far has undertaken, and that is do not jump the gun; do not go out half-cocked and start blanket bombing everything. Figure out what those targets are. Pick those targets carefully and eliminate them. And do not for one moment again be convinced that anything short of eradication of that cancer is going to cure the cancer.

Can you imagine going into the doctor and the doctor saying, well, we got the cancer, but we left a little of it around because we really did not want to offend the cancer. We did not want to go too deep into it.

You know as well as I know that if you have got cancer and they can get access to it, you want them to cut out every last cell of that cancer. The same thing applies here. We need to cut out every last terrorist cell that we can find in this world, because if we do not, as Tony Blair said yesterday in his remarks, if we do not defeat it, referring to the terrorism, if we do not defeat it, it will defeat us. It is that simple. It is a very clear distinction to make. It is as clear as night and day. We either beat it, or it beats us. We either defeat it, or it defeats us. It is a very simple proposition. You win, or you lose. There is no halfway point, none at all.

In this particular case, the winner takes it all. Remember that song by ABBA, "the winner takes it all." That is exactly what we are facing here with this terrorism. If we do not beat it, it will beat us.

Fortunately, the good people of this country have responded in a very strong manner, and they have shown this President and this government the support that this government feels is necessary to go out and eradicate the terrorist cells that exist, and they have expressed confidence that this administration and this government, that those of us who represent the people of this country, that we will not go out half-cocked and do things that are stupid.

Now, the American people also understand that this is a battle that will take a long time. The American people understand there will be casualties. The American people understand that every action has a reaction; that when we respond and when we begin with the capabilities to eradicate either a bank account or a terrorist cell or some other type of elimination of the threat, that there may be retaliation. How can you get into a battle without the threat of retaliation? Everybody beats on their drums when you threaten to

come after them. What other choice do they have?

Now, I feel very strongly that the American people want us to eradicate terrorism, the kind of terrorism that is demonstrated through either eco-terrorism within our own borders or the type of terrorism we saw committed within our borders but by people outside our borders on September 11.

I want to read to you a fascinating article, and I do not usually do this, read text. I like speaking without text. I rarely use notes. These are not my words that I am about to read you. These are the words of a young woman, I would guess she said when she moved to New York City she was 19, so she is somewhere I would say between 19 and 22 or 23 years old.

This article was found in Newsweek, dated October 1, 2001. The October 1 edition. If you have an opportunity to buy a Newsweek, take a look at it and read this article. It is fascinating.

This is a young girl, her name is Rachel Newman from New York City. I do not know her. I have never talked to her. I hope some day I have the privilege to meet her. She is about the same age as my three children. Lori's and my children are out of the home. Two of them just recently graduated from college, they are draft age. I have a 19-year-old girl in college, just about the same age as this Rachel Newman. Let me read the article to you. I know it is tough to listen to somebody who reads, especially on the floor like this. But give the meaning to the words and listen to her philosophy and what has happened to her since she personally witnessed an airplane go into one of those towers.

The article is entitled "The Day the World Changed, I Did Too."

"Just weeks ago, I thought of myself as a musician and a poet. Now I am calling myself a patriot. By Rachel Newman.

"I never thought listening to God Bless America would make me cry, but I guess crisis brings out parts of us we did not know existed. I have thought and felt things in the past several days that I never would have expected to. When I was 19, I moved to New York City to be a musician. The first thing I did was get a tattoo on each hand. One was of a treble clef, the other was of an insignia for Silver Tone guitars. I did it as a reminder of my commitment to making music, but also to ensure that I would never be able to work for an establishment corporation. I did not want to devote myself to someone else's capitalistic dream.

"If you asked me to describe myself then, I would have told you I was a musician, a poet, an artist, and, on somewhat a political level, a woman, a lesbian, and a Jew. Being an American would not have made my list. It is now 3 years later, and I am a junior at a Manhattan college.

"In my gender and economics class earlier this semester, we discussed the benefits of socialism, which provides for all members of society, versus capitalism, which values the self-interests of business people. My girlfriend and I were so frustrated by the inequality in America that we discussed moving to another country.

"On September 11th, all that changed. I realized I had been taking the freedoms I have here for granted. Now I have an American flag on my backpack, I cheer at the fighter jets as they pass overhead, and I call myself a patriot.

"I had just stepped out of the shower when the first plane crashed into the North Tower of the World Trade Center. I stood looking out the window of my Brooklyn apartment, dumbfounded as the second plane barreled into the South Tower. In that moment, the world as I had known it was redefined.

"The following Monday, my school reopened; and I headed for class. Foolishly thinking that life would 'get back to normal.' When I got off the subway, the first thing I saw were photocopied posters of the missing hanging on the walls of the station. There were color pictures of men and women of every shape and size, race and religion, lying on the beach, playing with their children on the living room floor, or dancing and laughing with husbands, wives or lovers.

□ 1830

"Once outside, I passed store fronts covered with even more photos. When I finally reached my building, I saw a police barricade that stretched down the block and was draped with posters on both sides. After I learned that my first class had been canceled for a campus forum with the university president, I sat in the courtyard and talked with some other dazed and distraught students. It became clear to me very quickly that people were strongly antihate toward innocent Arab Americans as I was, but they were also antiwar. I am not a violent person. I usually avoid conflict of any kind. I am also not a hateful person. I try to have an open mind and to respect other people's opinion. But when I heard my fellow students saying that they did not want to fight back, despite the terrorists' direct attack on our country, I felt they were confusing revenge with justice.

"I heard my peers say things like, 'This is our own fault for getting involved in everybody else's business.' And, 'This is because we support Israel and we shouldn't be doing that, because they took the land from the people that it belonged to.'

"It made me angry to hear my acquaintances try to justify atrocious terrorist acts. Many of these students don't see the difference in mentality between us, the majority of the people

in the world who desire peace, and them. The people who are willing to make themselves into human bombs to destroy thousands of lives. These terrorists despise our very existence. Americans have to be educated about the history of the Middle East. We can't afford to have uninformed opinions, no matter what course of action we think the United States should take.

"I am doing my part. Weeks ago, all I could think of was how to write a good rap. Now I am putting together an informational packet for students on our foreign policy towards the Middle East.

"In an ideal world, pacifism is the only answer. I am not eager to say this, but we do not live in an ideal world. I do not believe that our leaders should be callous or bomb already ravaged countries like Afghanistan. I worry that innocent citizens in that country will have a much different reaction to our fighter jets than I do. Americans may want peace, but terrorists want bloodshed. I have come to accept the idea of a focused war on terrorists as the best way to ensure our country's safety. In the words of Mother Jones, 'What we need to do now is pray for the dead and fight like hell for the living.'"

That was an article by Rachel Newman, and she was 19 when she moved to New York. Obviously from the article she is now about 23 years old. I think it is one of the best pieces that I have read during my entire political career. I hope some day I have an opportunity to meet this person. I think this article is incredible, and I think it describes very accurately what is happening out there for those people who somehow think that these barbarians, that these terrorists, that this cancer is somehow justified.

No matter what our beliefs are, how could we ever imagine, how could we ever believe so strongly that somebody could blindly go without discrimination and hit a tower with such fierceness that people are leaping out of the tower to their death 110 stories down below? There is a picture out there showing a couple holding hands as they leap off the building. How can we possibly look at a country as good and as strong and as wonderful as the United States of America and say that the United States of America and its people deserve this? How could we say that any country in the world deserves an act of barbarism like was carried out in this country on September 11.

Now, I understand, I understand that in our Constitution, and I am proud, frankly, that our Constitution allows freedom of speech. So I do not deny anybody the right to make those statements, but they have an obligation to understand what their statements are. It is kind of like the professor in Amherst, Massachusetts, who, the night

before this took place, made a big issue about Amherst was flying, that people in that town were flying their flags too often and they should be restricted from flying their American flags. Mr. Speaker, there are consequences to free speech. You can make it, but do not be upset when people question you, or when people I think who have a fundamental right to come to you and say, how do you justify that? I do not deny these people the right to make that freedom of speech, but I despise the fact that they cut our country short, that they do not realize that the people that carried out this horrible act of barbarism against our country were seeking to undermine the very right that they were exercising, that is, the right of free speech.

Do we think for one moment that these people have human rights in the beliefs that they exercise? Remember, this is not the religion of Islam. Islam does not allow violence, unless you have jihad, which jihad is a description of a battle against an injustice, and even jihad has rules. Jihad requires that you not kill women and children. Jihad says, you do not destroy a soldier who does not have his weapon drawn. Jihad says that you did not destroy buildings; you do not destroy a tree that even has a green leaf on it. All of these principles were violated.

This act of violence was carried out under the cloak of the Muslim population or under the cloak of the Islam-type of religion or under the Koran book, but that is all false. These people had one thing in mind: not to further the belief of Islam, not to further the needs of the Muslim people, but to destroy a society that has been a society of freedom, that has been a society of constitutional rights, the right of movement, the right to own private property, the right of equality. The second that any of us hear someone try and justify this act or somehow support the people that are behind this, take a look at how they treat women. Take a look at their record on human rights. Take a look at what other contributions, positive contributions they have made for society.

Not very long ago, I heard somebody say, well, you at least have to put yourself in their shoes. They believe so deeply in their cause that when they flew those airplanes and they got in those planes, they knew they were going to give their lives in this mission to hit those towers, or to hit the Pentagon. I about fell over. Do we know what the mission of those people were, those terrorists? It was pure and simple. It was to commit suicide in order to destroy other human life, and destroy a society. They did not discriminate. They did not care whether they killed children. They did not care whether they killed mothers. They did not care whether they killed fathers. They did not care whether they killed

military, cops, firemen, preachers, Muslim, fellow Muslims, fellow people of their religious beliefs. They did not care. All they wanted to do was kill people, and that was their mission. That is what they gave their life for.

Now, not long after they gave their life to destroy life, there was what, 300-and-some firemen and 200-and-some police officers who ran up the stairs of those towers to meet certain death. They knew they were going to die when they went up those towers. But that was their mission, and that was their duty. What did they give their lives for? They gave their lives to save lives. They gave their lives to go up to people who were injured, who were hurt, who were scared and save their lives. So how can anybody not draw a clear distinction between wholesomeness and cancer? That is exactly what those terrorists are. They are the worst case of cancer our society has ever known.

Fortunately, there is a commitment of our society, there is a commitment from governments all over this world. The coalition that our administration has put together is a strong coalition, and they have one goal in mind: to beat it. Because if we do not beat it, it is going to beat us. As I said earlier in my remarks, this is a very clear decision. In this case, the winner takes it all. We either beat it or it beats us. As Tony Blair, again, as I said earlier in my remarks, Tony Blair said so well yesterday, so well yesterday, that if we do not defeat it, it will defeat us. When we talk about defeating us, look at what America has offered to the world.

There is nothing, in my opinion, to apologize for for being an American. I do not stand in front of anybody and apologize for being a citizen of the United States of America. I have no apologies for the United States of America. This country has fed more people than any other country of the history of the world; and many, many of those people are outside our borders.

This country has done more for other countries, specifically including the country of Afghanistan, and other countries out there, has done more for those countries than any other country in the history of their country. This country has done more to protect the freedom of religions around this world than any other country in the history of the world. There is no other country in the history of the world that allows the types of freedom of speech, freedom of protest, freedom of assembly, freedom of private property than the United States of America. There is no country in the world that has educated more people than the United States of America. There is no country in the world that has made more contributions to the field of medicine and health care than the United States of America. There is no other country in the history of the world that has gone time and time and time again with its



military might outside its borders to help its friends and allies throughout the world.

Take a look the next time you are in Europe, see what kind of cemeteries are over there. Take a look at that. Those are American cemeteries over there. Those are young American men, and in today's society, they would be young American men and women, if that conflict were to occur today. We are willing to make sacrifices for the good of the world.

Now, sure, some people may gripe because, well, America does not quite have it right there, and maybe we need some adjustment; but as a whole, we have nothing to apologize about. Now we face an enemy that is spread thin, that has been very effective in its first strike. Remember, they got the first hit. Now, we get to come back. But nonetheless, we have to say, they were fairly effective in the horrible, horrible harm that they did to this Nation. But this Nation will respond, and it will respond in a unified fashion. Unified not only within our borders as reflected by the poll results and so on and just going out on the street and talk about it or listen to people, as reflected by people like Rachel Newman who wrote, as I said earlier, one of the finest articles I have ever seen, but also reflected this uniformed, shoulder-to-shoulder type of attitude is reflected with countries throughout the world, whether it is our good, solid brothers and sisters in the United Kingdom, whether it is our allies in Mexico, in the country of Mexico, our neighbor to the south.

By the way, an interesting thing I would like to bring up, our military recruiters, I had a couple of recruiters tell me that they are actually getting calls out of the country of Mexico, our neighbors to the south, of Mexican citizens who want to come up and join the U.S. military to fight for this country because they believe in this country. Now, that is a good neighbor. Canada to the north. I mean, face it. We are ready for the challenge. We wish we did not have the challenge, just the same as every one of us wishes we would never get cancer. But the fact is, cancer and terrorism have struck. They are both deadly. They both fit in exactly the same description, in the same bowl, and both of them need to be eradicated. This battle will be won by the United States and its allies. It will not be won by the countries that advocate, shelter, or actively participate in acts of terrorism as a cause. It will not work.

Now, what are some of the things that we need to do in this country?

□ 1845

Mr. Speaker, there are a couple of things that I ask Members to keep in mind as we begin to go through.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, we need to persevere in our support for the Gov-

ernment. That is not to say that our constituents should not have a right, and obviously they have the right, to question what we are doing. That is one of the checks and balances in our system.

But we have to continue to give our support when it is appropriate; and I think it is appropriate, in a maximum capacity right now, frankly, to our administration as we carry out the type of response that is necessary to eradicate the terrorist acts or the terrorists that have done this, propounded this horrible evil upon our country.

But there is another issue we have to address as the Congress of the United States: missile defense. We are absolutely being foolhardy if we think that in the future there is not going to be either an intentional or an accidental missile launch against this country.

I do not believe today that Russia is going to intentionally launch a nuclear missile against the United States. I do not think that today China is going to launch a missile, a nuclear missile, intentionally against the United States. But I do believe the potential for an accidental launch out of either one of those countries could happen.

If Members think the destruction by an aircraft does something, wait until they see what a nuclear weapon does. I do believe that there are countries, and do Members think for one minute if these terrorists had a nuclear weapon instead of an airplane that they would not have used that nuclear weapon? If they had that nuclear weapon, that would have been a nuclear weapon deployed in New York City, not an airplane.

We have people out there who will use nuclear weapons against the United States of America, and we as the Congress have an inherent obligation, an inherent obligation to provide the maximum protection possible for our people from a nuclear missile attack. We can only do that, or a big part of what we can do rests with missile defense.

Mr. Speaker, we have to get on that road. We have tremendous technology. We are almost there. We have almost got it perfected where we can stop incoming missiles into this country. We need to complete those technical studies. We need to deploy in this country a missile defense system. That is critical.

So we talked about a couple of things: one, our perseverance as citizens of this country; two, our support for the administration and our military that is out there; then, our need for a missile defense system.

Now, let me talk about the final issue that I think is critical, and that is, we have to put some of this political correctness aside and we have to talk about the problem at our borders. The fact is, our borders are disorganized, and there are a lot of people who wish harm on this country that are crossing

it. In fact, some are probably crossing it as we now speak.

I was told by my good friend, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO), that there are 250,000 deportation orders out there for people who are in this country now illegally, and they have never even been served. No effort has been made to take these out and get these people out of this country.

Our borders are loose, and the follow-through, not just on the perimeter of the United States but once these people get in, for example, on student visas, we have a huge problem with student visas. What is happening is that a lot of people who get a student visa, which requires one to go to school, they never show up to school. They use that as their passport, the price of admission to get within our borders. Then they melt into society and nobody pursues them. Nobody goes after them.

We have to tighten our borders. I am not saying tighten the borders as to change the history of our country, which welcomes immigration. Our country was built and the greatness of this country was built on immigration. But we have gotten very, very sloppy; and we have an obligation to the people of this country to regulate and to tighten up this ship. We have to get it back in shape. Those borders are demanding attention today.

The resources I believe that are necessary will be appropriated by this Congress, but we have to get out of this era of being politically correct. It is not politically correct, for example, to ask a person too much about their private life, kind of like it used to be. Maybe it is not politically correct to have them go through your underwear when they look at your suitcase at the airport.

Some of these days have gone by. We have to become more realistic. We have to look with a realistic eye, not an idealistic eye but a realistic eye, as to what the threats are and what we need to do, while protecting and respecting the civil liberties granted to us under our Constitution.

I am confident that we can do it; that as a people, as a people, the response we will have as a result of September 11 will in the long run be positive for the entire world. We will represent the Statue of Liberty proudly as she looks out over those waters.

It is an obligation. It is an inherent responsibility of myself and every one of the Members in this Chamber to carry forward this country and the greatness that our forefathers have done. I have no doubt that we will do it.